

REMARKS

Claims 26, 29, 30, 32, 46, 47, 51-53, 56, 59, 63, 65, 67, 69 and 71 are amended. Claims 50, 54 and 55 are canceled. Claims 26-33, 36-43, 46-49, 51-53 and 56-71 are in the application for consideration.

Claims 53-61, 66, 68 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Such claims have been amended, or now depend from claims so amended, to refer to inner face portions in at least one cross section, and that the base extends from and is received between the opposing sidewall inner face portions in said at least one cross section. Such is inherent from Applicant's application as-filed, for example in the drawing depictions which show an exemplary stated cross section as showing such inner face portions and a base extending there between. Such is believed to overcome the Examiner's indefiniteness rejection in this regard, and it is respectfully requested that such be withdrawn. Reference to "face portions" necessitated amendment to claims 29, 30, and 53 to refer to "portion of the chamber liner apparatus" for clarification.

Further, allowed claims 51 and 52 were amended in like manner as each such referred to "inner faces", and it is believed that the lack of rejection of such claims in this regard was an unintended oversight by the Examiner.

Claims 59-61 and 70 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejections.

Such claims have been so amended, and should be allowed. Action to that end is requested.

Claim 50 was indicated to be "allowed" in the Office Action Summary Sheet and in the body of the Office Action in paragraph 23. Claim 50 depended from rejected claim 26, leaving the undersigned to conclude that the Examiner intended to indicate that claim 50 contained allowable subject matter but for its dependency from a rejected base claim. Accordingly, claim 50 has been canceled herein, but written into independent form by amendment to claim 26. The amended/added language in claim 26 has also been modified to preclude or overcome the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection as respects "inner faces". The subject matter of claim 50 previously having been indicated to be allowed, claim 26 as amended should now be allowed, and action to that end is requested. It is respectfully asserted that should the Examiner rule that amended claim 26 is not patentable, the Examiner is precluded from making any such next action "final" due to the previous indicated allowability of claim 50.

Independent claims 53 and 56 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,503,331 to Yudovsky et al. Claims 53 and 56 have been amended to recite a movable substrate platform which is supported by an underside shaft, with the base which extends from and received between the opposing sidewall inner face portions being received below the platform about the shaft. Such is supported by Applicant's application as-filed at least in Figs. 6-11 where a movable substrate platform is supported by an

underside shaft, and having the stated based received below the platform and about such shaft. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Such is neither shown nor suggested by Yudovsky et al.

Specifically, Yudovsky et al.'s component 123 is only shown to be positioned and positionable such that it is received above Yudovsky et al.'s substrate support platform. Accordingly, Applicant's amended claims 53 and 56 recite something which is neither shown nor suggested by Yudovsky et al., and the anticipation rejection thereover should be withdrawn. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. Action to that end is requested.

Withdrawn claims 32, 63, 65, 69 and 71 have been amended to change "portion" to "part". No change in scope occurs thereby, and such is made due to other reference to "portion" or "portions" in claims from which such depend. Such withdrawn claims should now be brought back into the case as depending from allowable base claims of or generic to the elected species.

The undersigned notes that a Supplemental Disclosure Statement was submitted on February 15, 2006. However, the undersigned has not received an initialed PTO 1449 from the Examiner considering that the submitted reference was considered. Such is not seen to be discretionary

with the Examiner, and is respectfully requested. Another Supplemental Disclosure Statement is included herewith.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9-28-06

By:



Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268